

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/954,799	09/18/2001	Todd A. Hinck	SMQ-068/P5659	SMQ-068/P5659 8191 EXAMINER	
46141	7590 04/14/200		EXAM		
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP 28 STATE STREET			FILE, ERIN M		
BOSTON, N			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
•			2611	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			DATE MAILED: 04/14/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				SV			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	7			
		09/954,799	HINCK ET AL.				
Office Action Sur	nmary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Erin M. File	2611				
The MAILING DATE of the Period for Reply	is communication appo	ears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FR - Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing of 1f NO period for reply is specified above, 1f Failure to reply within the set or extended Any reply received by the Office later that earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (OM THE MAILING DA r the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ate of this communication. he maximum statutory period w period for reply will, by statute, three months after the mailing	TE OF THIS COMMUNIC 6(a). In no event, however, may a re ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this	•			
Status							
1) Responsive to communic	ation(s) filed on 17 Ja	nuary 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .	· · ·	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is i	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance wit	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)	is/are withdraw owed. - <u>24</u> is/are rejected. is/are objected to.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objec	ed to by the Examiner	<u>.</u>					
10) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ The drawing(s) filed on \underline{o}	0)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 January 2002</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing shee		on is required if the drawing(aminer. Note the attached					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
2. Certified copies of 3. Copies of the certi	None of: the priority documents the priority documents fied copies of the prior e International Bureau	have been received. have been received in Apity documents have been (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-89)	2)		ummary (PTO-413)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav Information Disclosure Statement(s) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	ring Review (PTO-948))/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PT0 	O-152)			

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandergraaf (U.S. Patent No. 4,347,484).
- Claims 1, 12, Vandergraaf discloses a phase locked loop capable for use in a receiver circuit for receiving a data signal (col. 1, lines 11-14) with a feedback circuit for providing said receiver circuit with a plurality of feedback signals based on an output of said receiver circuit to synchronize receipt of signal (col. 2, lines 2-9). Although Vandegraaf fails to disclose a source synchronous signal, however, source synchronous signals, or signals which contain source

Art Unit: 2611

disclosed by Vandergraaf.

synchronizing information are well known in the art because of the advantage in synchronizing data and would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use a source synchronous signal the invention as

Page 3

Claim 3, Vandergraaf further discloses a filter to remove a voltage component of one of said receiver output signals to assert a filtered signal (col. 1, lines 40-44), a voltage controlled oscillator for generating a plurality time varying signals (col. 2, lines 2-9), and a phase interpolator to select one or more of a said plurality of time varying signals from said voltage controlled oscillator based on said filtered signal to provide said receiver with said plurality of feedback signals (col. 1, lines 32-44).

Claim 10, 21, 22, although Vandergraaf fails to disclose a differential signal, differential signaling is well known in the art because of its advantages in noise reduction and interference and would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use a differential signal in the invention as disclosed by Vandergraaf.

4. Claims 8, 11, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandegraaf as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Hartke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,969,579).

Art Unit: 2611

Claim 8, 23, although Vandegraaf fails to disclose multilevel signals, Hartke discloses multilevel pulse amplitude modulated signals (abstract). Multilevel signals are often used in the art because they allow for greater amounts of data to be transferred over a fixed amount of bandwidth. Because of the advantage in the use of multilevel signals it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Hartke into Vandegraaf.

Claims 11, 24, Hartke further discloses multi-level pulse amplitude modulation signals (abstract). Although Hartke does not specifically disclose two and four level PAM, two and four level PAM are the obvious number of levels of full multilevel signals. Hartke further discloses PAM signals are used to transmit information and control logic systems throughout the world (col. 1, lines 12-18). Because of the advantage of multilevel PAM signals it would be obvious to incorporate the multilevel PAM signals as disclosed by Hartke into the invention of Vandegraaf.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandegraaf as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Seno et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0190283).

Claim 9, Vandegraaf fails to disclose the voltage component is an alternating current voltage, however, Seno discloses a loop filter for removing an AC component ([0163]). Seno further discloses that the removal of the AC voltage

by the loop filter creates a control signal with a voltage level used for controlling the voltage controlled oscillator. Because of its advantage in control signaling it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to include the AC voltage removing filter as disclosed by Seno into the invention as disclosed by Vandergraaf.

Allowable Subject Matter

- Claims 2, 4-7, 13-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected 6. base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erin M. File whose telephone number is (571)272-6040. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about

Art Unit: 2611

Page 6

the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Erin M. File

4/13/2006

JEAN B. CORRIELUS PRIMARY EXAMINER

4-13-00